Direct Endorsement

U.S. Department of Housing

FHA Case Number:
Underwriter's Name:
Property Address:
scribe below how HUD's risk was increased.
a underwriter
hborhood influences reported by the appraiser.
scribe below how HUD's risk was increased.
n 203(b) without explanation.
that were rated below average or poor.
scribe below how HUD's risk was increased. ry and surrounding neighborhood.
nalyzed by the appraiser.
ood insurance obtained. nmunity did not participate in the Flood Insurance Program.
ns, and/or area shown in the sales comparison section.
cribe below how HUD's risk was increased. th the comparable properties.
dissimilar residential areas.
s were over six months old.
vere used. I the Underwriter did not address the issue.

Post-Endorsement Office of Housing Technical Review Checklist Federal Housing Commissioner Underwriter's Name:					
recillical neview Checklist	redetal flousing Commissionel Charmes shalle.				
	Property Address:				
Underwriter/Valuation Revi					
Please read instructions before completing to	nls form				
1. Subject Property					
Fair Poor Comments					
	ificantly increased HUD's insurance risk. Describe below how HUD's risk was increased.				
	Real property rights were not properly identified. (PUD, Condo, Leasehold) Legal description omitted or incomplete on the URAR and not addressed by the underwriter				
<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
2. Neighborhood					
	e documentation regarding unfavorable neighborhood influences reported by the appraiser.				
Fair Poor Comments					
Poor Check if one or more of the following sign	ificantly increased HUD's Insurance risk. Describe below how HUD's risk was increased.				
<u></u>	(e) processing; loan processed under Section 203(b) without explanation.				
U09 Other Comments					
3. Site/Property Description					
	y were not included in closing package.				
	al documentation on the property's attributes that were rated below average or poor.				
7 dii 1001 Comments					
	ificantly increased HUD's insurance risk. Describe below how HUD's risk was increased. t with the highest and best use of the property and surrounding neighborhood.				
Underwriter did not reject the property until the zoning issue was mitigated.					
	ive encumbrances that were identified and analyzed by the appraiser.				
U16 Private roads/maintenance agreem	erwriter did not require additional information. Jent not addressed by underwriter.				
U17 Issues concerning water/sewer systems not resolved.					
U18 Underwriter failed to obtain FEMA Zone, Map Number and date. No evidence flood insurance obtained.					
U19* Property in location requiring flood insurance and the appraiser reported the community did not participate in the Flood insurance Program.					
U20* Property is unacceptable for mortga	age insurance for the following reason(s):				
Comments					
4. Cost Approach					
U23 Underwriter improperly reviewed ap	praiser's Marshall and Swift 1007 calculations, and/or				
	between appraiser's sketch and gross living area shown in the sales comparison section.				
Fair Poor Comments					
	ficantly increased HUD's insurance risk. Describe below how HUD's risk was increased.				
=	ner the subject's site value was consistent with the comparable properties.				
5. Sales Comparison Analysis					
· · · · · ·	anation for considerably distant comparable (dissimilar assistant)				
	anation for considerably distant comparables/dissimilar residential areas. on from the appraiser when the comparables were over six months old.				
	unation when no conventional comparables were used.				
U31 There were no adjustments for sales or financing concessions, if applicable, and the Underwriter did not address the issue.					
Fair Poor Comments					
	icantly increased HUD's insurance risk. Describe below how HUD's risk was increased.				
U33 Sales analysis did not include mark					
U34 Market value estimate failed to fall v	vithin the range indicated by the values after adjustments.				



U35 apparent dis	screpancy.	·	e comparables on the report and the Underwriter failed to resolve			
U36 U37 U40	Adjustments are not consistent and there is no expl Adjustments exceed 25% overall, 15% net, and 10% Other Comments	% for an individual line item wit				
6. Incom	ne Approach (3 and 4 unit properties on	ıly)				
U41	Gross Market Rent and Gross Rent Multiplier were Other Comments	•	lata. Underwriter did not require additional information.			
7. Recor	nciliation of Value					
Poor Chec	ck if one or more of the following significantly increase	ed HUD's insurance risk. Desc	cribe below how HUD's risk was increased.			
U48	Final value estimate was not consistent with data pr	estimate was not consistent with data presented and no explanation provided by underwriter.				
U49	U49 Underwriter deleted repair requirements and/or waived valuation condition(s) without adequate justification/explanation.					
U50	Other					
Fair	Poor Comments					
8. Other	Report Requirements					
U60	Map showing location of the subject property and a	Il comparables was not include	ed in the report.			
U61 Building sketch showing dimensions was not attached.						
U62			the valuation condition (VC) sheet; underwriter did not resolve.			
Fair	Poor Comments					
Poor Chec	Poor Check if one or more of the following significantly increased HUD's insurance risk. Describe below how HUD's risk was increased.					
U65 Appraiser's signature and ID number were omitted from the URAR. U66 Other Comments						
U66	Other Comments					
Additional Comments:						
			· •			
• Indicates	deficiencies that may warrant Indemnification					
Completed b	ру:	Date	CHUMS ID Number			
Title			FHA Case No			

Instructions

Direct Endorsement Post-Endorsement Technical Review Checklist

Review of the Underwriter's Review of the Appraisal

This Direct Endorsement (DE) checklist is designed to assist in technical reviews for evaluating and assigning ratings of underwriters. This checklist identifies the most common deficiencies in appraisals resulting in fair or poor ratings. (Any one element rated poor should result in an overall poor rating. Enter overall ratings on Form HUD 54118.) In addition to providing a means of assigning ratings throughout HUD's Field Office network in a consistent manner, the checklists are designed to alert the reviewer to "warning signs" that may indicate fraud and identify deficiencies that may warrant indemnification. When deficiencies are identified that require referral of the file to HUD's Mortgagee Monitoring Division for possible indemnification or to the Office of Inspector General for Investigation, a memorandum should be prepared to transmit the file. The memorandum should contain a photocopy of the completed checklist as supporting documentation.

Desk Review of the Underwriter's Review of the Appraisal

When evaluating the DE Underwriter's performance in reviewing the Uniform Residential Appraisal Report, the emphasis must be on the accuracy and consistency of the report and the methodology used in determining the value

of the property for mortgage insurance purposes. This form, HUD-54118-UND, is used by the reviewer to rate the DE Underwriter. Form HUD-54118-VAL is used to rate the appraiser.

Documents

The reviewer must determine whether the appraisal report and its supplemental documents provide the necessary information to adequately analyze the property.

Document Analysis and Underwriter Rating

Fair: Ratings of "fair" must be accompanied by comments from the reviewer. Poor: Poor ratings must be justified by the reviewer. While the checklist indicates elements that constitute a poor rating, the reviewer is expected to explain how HUD's risk was significantly increased by the deficiency. For instance, if the reviewer found that the underwriter deleted repair requirements required by the appraiser, the reviewer must explain the increased risk to HUD. In this instance, the reviewer would state that the underwriter's deletion of the repair requirements undermined the continued marketability of the property.